UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/581,285	06/01/2006	Tetsuro Iwanaga	1422-0718PUS1	3178
2292 7590 09/28/2011 BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH PO BOX 747 FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040 0747			EXAMINER	
			KARPINSKI, LUKE E	
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1616	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/28/2011	ELECTRONIC

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)
10/581,285	IWANAGA ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit
LUKE KARPINSKI	1616

	12 1 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears of	on the cover sheet with the correspondence address					
THE REPLY FILED <u>19 September 2011</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS AF	PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.					
application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (v for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR	es: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the vith appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request					
periods:	final vaiantian					
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of the b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adviso						
no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the	ry Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In nan SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  NLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO					
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as						
set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  NOTICE OF APPEAL						
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in complianc	e with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of					
	thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since					
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but p  (a) They raise new issues that would require further consider						
<ul> <li>(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);</li> <li>(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better for appeal; and/or</li> </ul>	orm for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for					
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a corre NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	sponding number of finally rejected claims.					
<u> </u>	ee attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).					
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):						
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).						
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.						
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1 and 3</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:  AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE						
3. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and						
was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).  9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a						
showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).						
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.						
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER						
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u>						
<ul><li>12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (PTC</li><li>13. ☐ Other:</li></ul>	/SB/08) Paper No(s)					
/Johann R. Richter/	9/24/11					
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1616	J. C. T.					

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Arguments filed by applicant 9/19/2011 are not found persuasive. Applicant argues that Akiyama is not properly combinable with Jakobson due to being non-analogous art. This argument is not found persuasive because Akiyama is used as an evidentiary reference. Jacobson teaches the reaction of glycerols with fatty acids to form fatty acid ester polyglycerols but fails to explicitly disclose the specific glycerols claimed. Akiyama teaches that pentadecaglycerol and eicosaglycerol were known at the time and also known to be used in the reaction described by Jakobson. Jakobson teach that glycerols in general will work and Akiyama merely shows that the specifically claimed glycerols were not only known at the time but were known to be used in said reaction. Applicant also argues that Jakobson teaches only up to 60% oil and the claims recite 70% at minimum. This argument is not found persuasive because Jakobson teaches 70% oil component as said polyglycerols are considered an oil component. Further, it would have been routine optimization to increase said oil percentage to achieve the desired skin feel. Applicant also argues that the unexpected results provided in the declaration filed 5/09/2011 overcome the obviousness rejection. This argument is not found persuasive because there is no showing of unexpected results.